



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME POPULATION STATISTICS OF THE PACIFIC
COAST STATES.*BY WALTER F. WILLCOX, PH.D., LL.D., *Cornell University.*

During the last forty years of the nineteenth century the population of the United States grew at a rate which slowly but steadily decreased. This fact is obscured by the published figures for 1870, which are undoubtedly under the truth by some hundreds of thousands. If we accept as more accurate the revised figures for that year contained in the census of 1890 and later,† the rates of increase were as follows:

1860-70	26.6
1870-80	26.0
1880-90	24.9
1890-00	20.7

During the first seventy years of our national history no such steady change in the rate of increase was manifest and none such appears in European countries. On the contrary, during the last half of the nineteenth century the rate of growth in Europe as a whole apparently increased.‡ Still the uniformity of this change in the United States for thirty or forty years had led all students of population to expect its continuance into the twentieth century. Among the few who have made a serious effort to forecast the growth of American population, for a few years or a longer period, no one, I believe, anticipated that the rate of growth between 1900 and 1910 would exceed that between 1890 and 1900. Yet that is precisely what happened. The decennial increase instead of being less than 20.7 was 21.0, or 0.3 per cent. greater than in the earlier decade. Even 21.0 is too small, because the census of 1910 referred to April 15 as the determining date, while

*This paper was presented at the meeting of the American Statistical Association held with the University of California on August 12, 1915.

† Census of 1910, *Abstract*, p. 22. Elsewhere I have given my reasons for doubting the correctness of this revision. (See Am. Econ. Assn., *Studies*, August, 1897, p. 248). I do not believe that the rate of increase during the decade including the Civil War was greater than the rate during the succeeding decade. But for the present argument that question is of little importance.

‡ "The Expansion of Europe" (p. 46) in *Studies in Philosophy and Psychology*, Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1906.

that of 1900 referred to June 1 and, in consequence, the interval between the two censuses was only $9\frac{7}{8}$ years. When allowance for this change is made, the rate of decennial increase proves to have been 21.3, or 0.6 per cent. greater than during the preceding decade. This unexpected change in the rate of population growth tends to discredit all forecasts of our future population which assume that the increase follows any definite law.

To get some light upon this noteworthy modification in the growth of population, we may ask whether what was true of the whole country was true of the parts. For statistical purposes the country is divided into three main areas, the northern states, the southern states and the western states. The division line between north and south is Mason and Dixon's line, the Ohio, and the southern boundary of Missouri and Kansas; the division between these two and the western states is the western boundary of the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. The percentage of increase of each of these three divisions for each of the decennial periods is shown in the following table:

PER CENT. INCREASE OF POPULATION.

Division.	1860-70.	1870-80.	1880-90.	1890-1900.	1900-10.
North.....	27.6	26.9	24.9	19.0	17.7
South.....	21.9	21.7	21.3	22.4	19.8
West.....	80.1	58.5	75.5	31.9	66.7

The preceding figures show that the rate of growth of the northern states as a whole fell steadily throughout the half century. The rate of growth of the southern states has changed irregularly and very slightly, its total fall being little more than one fifth of that in the North. Perhaps there was an undercount in the southern states in 1890 as well as in 1870; at least various bits of evidence suggest that as a possibility. The figures show also that since 1890 the southern states have grown faster than the northern. The western states have had high and very irregular rates of growth, with a minimum during the last decade of the nineteenth century and a sharp increase ten years later.

This analysis indicates that between 1900 and 1910 the rates of increase in North and South, just as might have been expected, were less rapid than in any previous decade. It shows also that the unforeseen rise in the rate of growth of the United States in those ten years was due entirely to the fact that in the later decade the West increased more than twice as fast as in the earlier. The increase in the West raised the average for the whole country between 1890 and 1900 by 0.6 per cent. and between 1900 and 1910 by 2.6 per cent. In other words, the greater population and the higher rate of increase in the West in combination gave it more than four times the influence upon the entire country between 1900 and 1910 that it had ten years earlier.

When the West is divided into its two main components, the Pacific states, Washington, Oregon and California, and the Mountain states, and the figures found for each, the rate of growth in the Pacific states proves to have been higher between 1900 and 1910 than in any of the preceding four decades and for the first time higher than that of the Mountain states.

The striking increase in the rate of growth of the country as a whole, of the western division and especially of the Pacific Coast states since 1900, is one of the most noteworthy results and perhaps the most unexpected result of the Thirteenth Census. The general reasons for it are doubtless better known to residents of these states than they can be to one who now sees the West for the first time. Most of them also are incapable of detection or measurement by statistics and with such I have little concern. The general question which I hope to elucidate with certain figures is: "Why have the Pacific Coast states grown so rapidly since 1900?" the special question to which this paper is limited is: "What light do statistics throw upon the sources and character of that increase and the probability of its continuance?"

In the world as a whole an increase of population results from an excess of births over deaths and in no other way. But in any particular area of the earth's surface, like the United States or the Pacific Coast states, such an increase may result either from an excess of births over deaths (natural increase)

or from an excess of immigrants over emigrants (migratory increase). Usually, however, it is a resultant of these two forms.

This distinction between natural increase and migratory increase raises the question, "Is the recent growth of the Pacific Coast states due to either alone or to a combination of the two and, if to a combination, then what proportion of it is due to each source?"

For the direct study of migratory increase, there are no complete records of arrivals in or departures from these states. Immigrants arriving at the Pacific ports of the United States are registered, but how long they remain in the Pacific states and by what routes they depart, if they depart at all, are unknown elements of the problem. Arrivals by sea constitute probably a small fraction of the total arrivals. Those arriving by land come in part across the northern and southern boundaries of the country, but more largely from or through the easterly states. For this branch of the inquiry, then, no significant figures exist and we are compelled to content ourselves with the meager results which can be reached indirectly from a study of the census figures of birthplace and residence, to which I shall return.

For the direct study of natural increase the conditions look more favorable. Since 1906 California has had a state system of registering births and deaths and since 1908 Washington has had a similar system of registering deaths. Oregon has not yet introduced state registration in either form, but it would seem as if indications at least might be derived from the records of the other two states. Certainly the material deserves to be probed before accepting or rejecting it.

I begin with California where the records have existed longer than in Washington and include births as well as deaths. They have shown the following results:

BIRTHS AND DEATHS IN CALIFORNIA, 1906-1914.

Year.	Births.	Deaths.	Excess of		Birth Rate.	Death Rate.
			Births.	Deaths.		
1906.....	20,974	29,303		8,329	10.3	14.1
1907.....	24,674	31,095		6,421	11.6	14.6
1908.....	28,077	31,287		3,210	12.7	14.1
1909.....	30,828	30,985		157	13.4	13.4
1910.....	32,138	32,398		260	13.4	13.5
1911.....	34,828	34,012	816		14.0	13.7
1912.....	39,330	36,709	2,621		15.2	14.2
1913.....	43,852	38,599	5,253		16.4	14.4
1914.....	46,012	37,537	8,475		16.7	13.4

In eight years the births recorded have more than doubled, while the deaths have increased only 28 per cent. The increase in the births must be due mainly to the growing completeness of registration. This is shown by the fact that even now the birth rate of the state is incredibly low. Probably the true birth rate in California is not below that in France or Ireland. If so, 20 births a year to each 1,000 population may safely be assumed as a minimum. But the rate resulting from the figures of 1914 is only 16.7, or five sixths of a rate of 20 per 1,000. Again, the number of children under one year of age living in the state at any one moment must be approximately equal to the number of births in the preceding year diminished by the number out of this group who died before the day of enumeration was reached. The number of infants under one year of age enumerated in California April 15, 1910, was 40,336; if we assume that this number is not more than nine tenths of the number of births during the preceding year, the true number of births in California between April 15, 1909, and April 15, 1910, was not less than 45,000. But the number recorded in 1909 was 30,828, and in 1910 32,138, an annual average of 31,500. This estimate indicates that in 1909-10 not more than seven tenths of the births in California were registered. Certainly not all the births and probably not more than five sixths of them are now registered. Washington has no significant state records of births. Hence none of the three states has trustworthy birth rate figures, a defect which they share with the majority of other American states.

In case of a death, the body must be so bestowed as to reduce the chance that legal complications will arise or the health of survivors be endangered. Hence ordinarily records of deaths are more complete than those of births. Are the death records of California and Washington helpful in our problem? The death rates for the two states since their beginning are as follows:

Year.	Death rate of California.	Washington.
1906.....	14.1	?
1907.....	14.6	?
1908.....	14.1	9.3
1909.....	13.4	9.8
1910.....	13.5	10.0
1911.....	13.7	8.9
1912.....	14.2	7.9
1913.....	14.4	8.5

It will be noticed that between 1909 and 1913 the death rate of California rose slowly but steadily. This is no evidence of an actual increase of mortality and thus of a deterioration in the conditions within the state. It is rather a change in which all citizens of California may take pride as evidence that by coöperation of state and local authorities an increasing proportion of all the deaths which occur in the state were recorded.

The death rates of California and Colorado since 1906 show an interesting contrast.

Year.	Death rate of California.	Washington.
1906.....	14.1	14.0
1907.....	14.6	15.3
1908.....	14.1	14.5
1909.....	13.4	14.2
1910.....	13.5	13.8
1911.....	13.7	12.9
1912.....	14.2	11.6
1913.....	14.5	11.5

Since 1909 the death rate of California has been rising, while since 1907 that of Colorado has been falling. It might seem as if Colorado had been growing more healthful and California, less healthful. But the probable meaning of the figures is that Colorado has been growing more careless and California more careful in securing the registration of all deaths occurring within its limits. A death rate of 11.5 for a state like Colorado is highly improbable. No doubt many deaths escape registration or the population of the state is greatly overestimated or both. In order to avoid the complication of estimating population for an intercensal period in regions where the rate of growth is subject to sudden and violent fluctuations and the estimates therefore are likely to be very wide of the truth, and to allow for accidental variations in a single year, let us confine ourselves to the death rates for the three year period 1909-11. As the difficulties in the way of complete registration are much greater in sparsely settled districts than in cities, the effort to judge from internal evidence whether the records of deaths in California during those years were complete has been confined to the rural districts excluding all incorporated places having at least 8,000 or 10,000 inhabitants. An average death rate of less than 12 in these districts is so low as to arouse suspicion that not all the deaths are registered. An average death rate of less than 10 is so low as to make the suspicion almost a certainty.

In the following table the counties of California have been divided into three classes: those having a death rate below 10 per 1,000 in the rural districts and no doubt with incomplete registration; those with rates between 10 and 12 in their rural districts and probably with incomplete registration; and those with rates above 12 and thus perhaps not intrinsically improbable.

AVERAGE DEATH RATES IN RURAL PORTIONS OF CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1909 -11.

Under 10.		10-12.		Over 12.	
County.	Death Rate.	County.	Death Rate.	County.	Death Rate.
Mono	3.3	San Mateo	10.2	Monterey	12.0
Inyo	4.4	Fresno	10.4	Calaveras	12.3
Modoc	5.7	Marin	10.5	Colusa	12.4
Lassen	6.0	Contra Costa	10.6	Ventura	12.5
Imperial	6.7	Plumas	10.7	Placer	12.8
Glenn	7.0	Kings	10.9	Santa Cruz	13.0
Del Norte	8.2	San Luis Obispo	11.0	Los Angeles	13.2
Humboldt	8.2	Riverside	11.1	Sonoma	13.4
San Diego	8.2	San Benito	11.3	Mendocino	13.6
Merced	8.3	Solano	11.6	Tuolumne	13.6
Alpine	8.5	Orange	11.7	Shasta	13.9
Kern	8.9			Yolo	13.9
Sierra	8.9			Lake	14.2
Tulare	9.0			Amador	14.3
Mariposa	9.1			Trinity	14.5
Madera	9.2			Butte	14.8
Santa Barbara	9.6			Tehama	14.8
Sutter	9.7			Nevada	15.1
Siskiyou	9.8			Santa Clara	15.1
Stanislaus	9.8			San Bernardino	15.3
				Yuba	15.8
				San Joaquin	15.9
				Eldorado	16.3
				Sacramento	16.3
				Alameda	16.6
				Napa	25.4

In more than one half of the counties in California the published death rate for the rural districts is improbable and in many it is impossible.

In Washington the death rate in 1913 was only 8.5, nearly 2 per 1,000 below that in any other state. In 1906, South Dakota was admitted to the federal registration area and its death records accepted by the Census Bureau as approximately correct. Through 4 years it retained that position and its death rate was.

DEATH RATE IN SOUTH DAKOTA.

Year.	Ratio per 1,000.
1906	8.5
1907	9.1
1908	9.2
1909	8.5

After these 4 years the state was excluded from the registration area because of incomplete returns. The state of Washington now holds the unenviable position formerly occupied

by South Dakota. It might be wise for the Director of the Census to treat the Pacific Coast state in the same way in which South Dakota was treated six years ago. The inclusion of incorrect and misleading returns along with those which are significant tends to discredit the whole set of federal figures and to the uninformed suggests the unwarranted inference that Washington is far healthier than any of the 22 other states in the registration area.

But if the registration officials in the state of Washington were ready and eager to coöperate with the federal government, perhaps a compromise might be arranged whereby the state figures would be retained provisionally and so long as each annual death rate was higher than its predecessor, just as that of California has been for five years. In any state and especially in a sparsely settled state like Washington, the task of building up a system of death registration is long and difficult, and, if the process is really under way as proved by the results, I believe the Director of the Census should not exercise his discretionary power to exclude a state from the registration area.

The evidence, then, warrants the conclusion that the death records of Washington and the birth records, if not the death records, of California are very imperfect and as a result cannot serve as a basis for studying the recent growth of population in the Pacific states.

Thus far my conclusion has been the negative one that no significant materials exist for a direct study of the increase of population in the Pacific Coast states whether by excess of births over deaths or by excess of immigrants over emigrants or both.

In both fields, however, a substitute for registration figures, though only an inadequate one, exists in the census records of birthplace or of sex and age and an examination of these is now in order.

Persons living in the Pacific states grouped by birthplace are of three main classes, those born in foreign countries, those born in the Pacific states and those born in other parts of continental United States. To these should be added as a small residual class those whose birthplace was not stated,

those who were born in the United States but with state of birth unknown, those born abroad under the American flag, and those born in outlying districts of the United States, like Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, and the Philippines. All these classes combined constituted in 1910 about 1 per cent. of the population of the Pacific states. In the following analysis they will be disregarded.

Consider first the foreign born, or immigrant population, as a whole. The increase of population in the Pacific states between 1900 and 1910 was more than 1,750,000, more than three times the amount and at more than double the rate of increase in the preceding ten years. During the same period the increase of foreign born was more than 400,000, twelve times the increase of foreign born in the preceding ten years. Of the total increase, 1900-1910, nearly one fourth (23.3 per cent.) was an increase of the foreign born population, while in the earlier decade only one seventeenth (5.8 per cent.) was due to this current. This does not prove that the number of foreign born had increased faster than the number of American born. On the contrary, the two classes increased at about the same rate. But in the decade between 1890 and 1900 immigration to these states from foreign countries had almost ceased. In that decade the number of foreign born increased only 6 per cent., while in each of the other four decades it increased by at least one half.

An introductory survey of the main birthplace classes in the population of the Pacific states at each of the last five censuses can be obtained from the following brief table.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION OF PACIFIC COAST STATES, ACCORDING TO BIRTHPLACE.

Place of Birth.	1870.	1880.	1890.	1900.	1910.
Pacific states	32.8	38.9	36.6	42.4	35.8
Other continental United States	33.7	30.7	35.9	34.8	40.4
Outlying districts or unspecified			0.1	0.3	1.0
Foreign born	33.5	30.4	27.4	22.5	22.8
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

This shows that between 1870 and 1900 the proportion of foreign born in the population decreased from one third to little

more than one fifth, but during the following decade it remained substantially unchanged. The outstanding fact revealed by the table is the great increase between 1900 and 1910 in the proportion of the population of the Pacific states drawn from other parts of the country. In other words, the population of the Pacific states has grown so rapidly since 1900 because natives of other sections of the United States have been flocking westward. There has been no corresponding increase in the natives of the Pacific states. As a recently opened region fills with population the proportion of natives usually tends to rise and the proportion of immigrants to fall. In the preceding table the natives of the Pacific states in 1870 were less than one third, and in 1900 were more than two fifths of the population. By 1910 the proportion had sunk below what it was in 1880, 1890, or 1900. The foreign born fall into two groups styled by the census "white" and "colored." The term "colored" is used as a convenient generic term to include all racial elements other than the European whites. It embraces Negroes, Indians, Malays, Chinese, and Japanese. Whether this is good ethnology may fairly be questioned. But good ethnology is hardly to be reconciled with the requirement that its tests should be understood and, when necessary, applied by an army of more than 70,000 enumerators.

In the Pacific states the only numerous components of the foreign born colored are the Chinese and Japanese. In these states in 1910 there were 94,000 foreign born colored and 104,000 Chinese and Japanese. The excess of 10,000 Chinese and Japanese over all foreign born colored is due to the fact that thousands of the former claimed, some no doubt wrongly, to have been born in the United States. In the entire country there were nearly 20,000 Chinese and Japanese who claimed to have been born in the United States. The majority were probably residing in the Pacific states, where both elements have been domiciled for the longest time. The foreign born colored in the Pacific states decreased by 14,000 between 1890 and 1900 and increased by 22,000 between 1900 and 1910, a total increase of 8,000 in twenty years. During the same twenty years the foreign born whites increased by more than 400,000. As a result the foreign born colored are

a dwindling proportion of the total foreign born. In 1890, they were 16.7 per cent., in 1900, 13.2 per cent., and in 1910, 9.9 per cent. of the foreign born. Because of this relative decrease in the foreign born colored the proportion of whites in the total population of the Pacific states has been rising:

Date.	Per Cent White.
1860	87.0
1870	90.1
1880	89.5
1890	92.9
1900	94.9
1910	96.0

The tendency towards an increasing predominance of whites in the total population appears in the whole United States as well as in the Pacific states, but in the latter the increase since 1860 has been 9.0 per cent., while in the whole country it has been only 3.3 per cent., or little more than one third as great.

A rough estimate of the number of foreign born who arrived in the Pacific states between 1900 and 1910 may be reached by starting with the number of foreign born residing in the Pacific states in 1900 and subtracting the probable number who died before 1910. This number of deaths has been estimated by applying to the foreign born in the Pacific states the death rate of the foreign born whites in the registration area in 1900. The group was probably reduced between 1900 and 1910 by about 92,750 deaths, leaving, if emigration be ignored, about 451,600 survivors in 1910 of the foreign born who had been in the Pacific states in 1900. If this number be subtracted from the total foreign born in these states in 1910, it leaves 504,200 as the number of survivors in 1910 from the foreign born who had arrived in these states during the preceding decade. Assuming that they had been in these states on the average five years, the number of arrivals needed to produce this number of survivors was about 553,500. That this number exceeds by 235,000 the number of foreign born in the Pacific states who had been in the United States less than ten years may be explained by the fact that many foreign born who had

arrived in the United States before 1900 and had been gradually advancing across the continent reached the Pacific states after 1900.

Consider now the increase in immigrants coming from other sections of the United States or more accurately the increase in natives of other sections residing in the Pacific states. The total population increased 74 per cent.; the foreign born, 76 per cent.; those born and residing in the Pacific states increased only 46 per cent.; but the natives of other states residing in the Pacific states increased 105 per cent. Obviously the Pacific states since 1900 have recruited their numbers primarily from the natives of other states and least of all from their own loins. The immigration of natives from other states as roughly measured by these birthplace figures more than doubled during the decade. The heaviest contributions came from the Mississippi Valley states, Illinois, Missouri, and Iowa, but the most rapid increase in the flow between 1900 and 1910 was from the states farther west and the slowest increase from the states farther east and especially from New England. In order to define the contributory area more accurately I have prepared the accompanying table, showing the number of natives of each state east of them living in the Pacific states in 1900 and in 1910 with the per cent. of increase during the decade.

In the following table, Oklahoma, Florida, and Nevada are exceptional. The population residing in Oklahoma more than doubled and that born in Oklahoma increased 160 per cent. between 1900 and 1910. Probably, also, the average age of the natives of the state increased, as the average age of its residents certainly did, and as a rule migration is more common in adult life. The increased migration from Florida to the Pacific states is probably connected with the similarity of agricultural conditions in Florida and southern California, and the great prosperity of sub-tropical agriculture in California since 1900. This explanation is made more probable by the fact that the increase has gone mainly to California rather than to Oregon or Washington. Nevada shows a small increase because the emigration from that state in the years before 1900 had been abnormal.

NATIVES OF STATE SPECIFIED RESIDING IN PACIFIC STATES, 1900 AND 1910, WITH
PER CENT. OF INCREASE.

State.	Number.		Per Cent. Increase.
	1900.	1910.	
Oklahoma.....	1,061	10,695	908.0
Colorado.....	6,994	26,429	277.9
North Dakota.....	3,939	13,691	247.5
Montana.....	4,035	13,762	241.6
Florida.....	665	2,102	216.1
South Dakota.....	5,199	16,376	215.0
New Mexico.....	1,198	3,669	206.3
Arizona.....	2,498	7,369	195.0
Minnesota.....	30,860	88,069	185.4
Idaho.....	5,245	14,941	184.9
West Virginia.....	3,962	11,143	181.2
Wyoming.....	1,367	3,590	162.6
Michigan.....	33,945	87,523	157.8
Nebraska.....	19,333	48,583	151.3
Texas.....	12,425	30,977	149.3
Georgia.....	3,705	9,174	147.6
Wisconsin.....	38,348	94,035	145.2
Utah.....	4,606	11,264	144.5
Kansas.....	33,238	75,238	126.4
North Carolina.....	5,456	12,205	123.7
Alabama.....	3,190	7,029	120.4
Arkansas.....	7,985	17,546	119.7
Mississippi.....	2,859	6,019	110.5
Iowa.....	62,534	131,064	109.6
Kentucky.....	17,228	35,456	105.9
<i>U. S. outside of Pacific states.....</i>	<i>824,372</i>	<i>1,691,505</i>	<i>105.2</i>
Illinois.....	81,838	166,396	103.3
Indiana.....	39,398	79,938	102.9
Louisiana.....	4,172	8,282	98.5
Tennessee.....	14,543	28,726	97.6
Pennsylvania.....	46,135	90,952	97.1
South Carolina.....	1,542	2,955	91.7
Missouri.....	69,160	131,907	90.7
Ohio.....	64,754	119,007	83.8
New Jersey.....	7,748	14,012	80.8
Delaware.....	966	1,701	76.1
Virginia.....	11,520	19,183	66.5
Connecticut.....	6,471	10,748	66.1
Rhode Island.....	2,577	4,071	58.0
District of Columbia.....	1,430	2,230	55.9
Maryland.....	5,632	8,770	55.7
Massachusetts.....	25,334	38,844	53.3
New York.....	83,562	127,813	52.9
New Hampshire.....	5,235	7,050	34.9
Vermont.....	9,001	12,027	33.6
Nevada.....	8,648	11,427	32.1
Maine.....	22,731	27,508	21.0

If the emigration of native Americans to the Pacific Coast states is analyzed with due regard to the populousness of the contributing states and the proportion of the natives of each state who were living in the Pacific Coast states to the total natives of the state living in the United States, it appears that the smallest contributions, less than 1 per cent. of the total natives, came from the southeastern states, New Jersey to Arizona inclusive in 1900 and New Jersey to Louisiana in 1910;

that the states contributing 1 to 3 per cent. of their natives in 1900 were northern states from Maine to South Dakota (with Utah), and in 1910 were a belt of states stretching across the country from New Hampshire to New Mexico; and that the states contributing more than 3 per cent. of their natives were the northern and western states from Iowa to Arizona (1900) or Michigan to Arizona (1910).

Consider now the increase between 1900 and 1910 in the natives of the Pacific states living in these states. This number rose by only 46.4 per cent., a ratio much less than the increase in any other of the population groups. This slow increase suggests either that the true death rate in the Pacific states is high, and this is not borne out by any evidence at hand, or that the true birth rate is abnormally low, and this is in harmony with what we know from other sources. To my mind, the best single substitute which the data allow for an American birth rate is the proportion of children under five years of age to the number of potential mothers, or women of age to bear children, an age which is roughly defined as 15 to 44 or 15 to 49, sometimes one group and sometimes the other being available. In the United States as a whole in 1910 there were 446 children under 5 to 1,000 women 15 to 49 years of age, and for half a century this proportion had steadily and rapidly decreased. If we divide the United States into the three parts, Pacific, Mountain, and rest of the United States, the proportions of children to 1,000 women in 1910 were as follows:

Division.	Children under 5 to 1,000 Women 15-49.	Per Cent. Deviation from Average.
Pacific.....	343	-23
Mountain.....	488	+10
Rest of United States.....	449	+ 1
Total.....	446	0

The proportion of children in the Pacific states is 23 per cent. below the average for the country, which may be taken as the normal, and 30 per cent. below that in the Mountain states, next east of this area. The conclusion that the Pacific states are characterized by an extremely low birth rate is an unavoid-

able one. The following figures show that the birth rate as thus measured has been steadily falling for half a century and is now less than half (44.5 per cent.) of what it was in 1860.

Date.	Children to 1,000 Women 15-49 Years of Age in Pacific Coast States.
1860.....	771
1870.....	653
1880.....	541
1890.....	424
1900.....	379
1910.....	343

On the whole, the evidence indicates that the astonishing increase of population in these states since 1900 has been mainly due to immigration in some degree from abroad, but especially from other states, and slightly due to excess of births over deaths. Increase as a permanent and normal social process usually depends primarily upon natural increase and a growth of population resulting mainly or entirely from immigration has a weaker guarantee of permanence. While the evidence in hand does not warrant a definite answer, it does point to a slackening in the growth of population of the Pacific states as likely to occur in the near future.